

Appln. No.: 10/081,968
Amendment Dated September 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2005

NSG-207US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-39 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 11-39 are withdrawn from consideration, claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as including an unqualified relative term and claims 3, 5 and 7-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Tabata et al. Claims 5 and 10 are amended and 3 and 9 are canceled by this amendment. Basis for the amendment to claim 5 may be found in the specification in Fig. 17 and at page 26, line 20 through page 27, line 5. No new matter is added by these amendments.

The rejection of claim 7 is overcome by amending the claim to replace the term "reflectance" by its definition. As defined in *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, Merriam Webster Inc., 1983, at page 989, "Reflectance" is "the fraction of the total radiant flux incident upon a surface that is reflected and that varies according to the wavelength distribution of the incident radiation." The amendment to claim 7 is consistent with this definition. As claim 7 has been amended to remove the unqualified relative term, it is no longer subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The rejection of claims 3, 5 and 7-10 is overcome by the cancellation of claims 3 and 9, and by the amendments to claims 5 and 10. In particular, Tabata et al. do not disclose or suggest, "a reflecting plate arranged on the rear-surface of said light-guide plate and on at least one of the peripheral side-surfaces of said light-guide plate," as required by amended claim 5. Tabata et al. describe an illumination device in which light that has entered from an entrance surface to the interior of the light guide element is scattered by a diffusion area to emerge from an exit surface in a predetermined direction. The diffusion area "can be formed by roughening a portion of that opposite surface or by applying a reflection coating thereto." (See col. 5, lines 43-47). Tabata et al., however, do not disclose or suggest a reflecting plate on both the rear surface and at least one of the peripheral side surfaces of the light-guide plate as required by amended claim 5.

Because Tabata et al. do not disclose or suggest this limitation of amended claim 5, claim 5 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Tabata et al. Claims 7, 8 and amended claim 10 depend from claim 5 and are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Tabata et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 5.

Appln. No.: 10/081,968
Amendment Dated September 6, 2005
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2005

NSG-207US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 7, 8 and 10.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/tmb/bj

Dated: September 6, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (571)273-8300 on:

September 6, 2005


Beth Johnson

BETHL1:VNSG\207US\FINAL AMENDMENT.DOC